２０２３年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期２年の課程入学試験

（　春期・一般選抜　）問題

専門科目Ⅰ　　＿＿＿言語学＿＿＿　専攻分野

試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。

成

績

２０２３年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期２年の課程入学試験

（春期・一般選抜）問題

専門科目Ⅰ（　　　　言語学　　　専攻分野）

I.　次の文章を読んで，問（1）～（4）に答えなさい。

　I will be concerned with the nature of the representations of the referents of linguistic expressions in the minds of interlocutors. In particular, I will be concerned with the changes which these mental representations may undergo in the course of a conversation and with the linguistic forms which code these changes. The set of representations which a speaker and a hearer may be assumed to share in a given discourse will be called the DISCOURSE REGISTER. I will tend to neglect the terminological (but not the conceptual) distinction between REFERENTS and the MENTAL REPRESENTATIONS OF REFERENTS in a discourse. It is primarily the latter that I will be concerned with in the following discussion.

　Discourse referents may be either entities or propositions[1]. A proposition may acquire the status of a discourse referent once it is assumed by a speaker to be known to the addressee, i.e. once it has been added to the set of pragmatic presuppositions in the discourse register. The mental representation of such a propositional referent may then be stored in the register together with the representations of entities. Like expressions denoting entities, those denoting presupposed propositions may serve as arguments of a predicate[(i)]. Propositional referents may be expressed via various kinds of subordinate clauses (including non-finite verb phrases) or they may be expressed by pronouns, as in the following short text (from a cereal box):

(1)　This package is sold by weight, not by volume … If *it* does not appear full when opened, *it* is because contents have settled during shipping and handling.

In (1), the referent of the first *it* is the entity designated by the antecedent NP *this package*, i.e. the cereal box; the referent of the second *it* is the proposition (or state of affairs) expressed in the antecedent clause *it does not appear full when opened*. (The mood operator *if* does not enter into the antecedent-anaphor relation.) While the representation of the entity exists in the mind of the addressee prior to its linguistic expression on the box, the representation of the propositional referent is created via the clausal antecedent itself (unless the state of affairs described is already known to

the reader, in which case it is being reactivated). By the time they are anaphorically referred to with definite pronouns, both constitute discourse referents, which may serve as arguments in a predicate-argument structure.

Discourse referents are syntactically expressed in ARGUMENT (including adjunct) categories, such as noun phrases, pronouns, various kinds of tensed or non-tensed subordinate clauses, and certain adverbial phrases[ii] (those that can be said to refer to the circumstances of a predication).[2] They cannot normally be expressed in phrases which serve as PREDICATES. Predicates by definition do not denote discourse referents but attributes of, or relations between, arguments. For example a finite verb phrase cannot play an argument role in a sentence, unless it is made into a referential expression by being "nominalized" (in the sense of traditional grammar), i.e. by being stripped of its tense and person markings. This is shown in the following contrasts:

(2)   a. We went to the movies yesterday.

        b. *It* was a mistake.

        c. *Our going to the movies yesterday* was a mistake.

        d. *Going to the movies yesterday* was a mistake.

        e. **Went to the movies yesterday* was a mistake.

In (2b), the subject *it* refers to the propositional content of the entire preceding sentence (2a). The function of this pronoun is similar to that of the second *it* in (1) above. Sentence (a), or the proposition denoted by it, appears in PRONOMINAL form in (b) and the proposition referred to by the pronoun now has the status of a discourse referent. Sentence (a) can also be NOMINALIZED, as in the subject expression *our going to the movies* in (c). It is also possible to nominalize the verb phrase alone, as in (d) (*going to the movies*). This nominalization involves an understood subject, hence counts semantically as a proposition, hence may serve as the argument of another predicate. However, as (e) shows, the finite verb phrase *went to the movies* cannot itself function as an argument[iii]. The morphosyntactic difference between non-finite and finite (or tensed) clauses is another grammatical correlate of the fundamental communicative distinction between pragmatic PRESUPPOSITION and ASSERTION. Nominalizing a proposition is one way of marking it as non-asserted.

A potential problem for my account of <u>the difference in discourse-referential status between arguments and predicates</u>[iv] is the occurrence of expressions with predicate morphology in topic position and function, as e.g. in the German sentence *Arzt ist er nicht* "He's not a doctor" (lit. "A doctor he is not"), used to answer the question *Ist er Arzt?* "Is he a doctor?" In the reply, the bare noun *Arzt* functions as an anaphoric topic expression, hence its denotatum must have the status of a discourse referent, even though it has the grammatical appearance of a predicate nominal (it lacks a determiner). That *Arzt* must indeed be a referential argument expression is demonstrated by the fact that it could be replaced by the definite anaphoric pronoun *das* "that", as in *Das ist er nicht* "That he isn't." Nevertheless, both *Arzt* and *das* function as the non-subject complements of the copula *ist*, i.e. they correspond to the traditional definition of predicates, except for their position. Similarly problematic for my account is the occurrence of anaphoric pronouns referring to predicate adjectives, as e.g. in the French sentence *Ça il l'est* "That he is" (lit. "That he is it") used as a reply to *Est-ce qu'il est intelligent?* "Is he intelligent?", where both the free topic pronoun *ça* and the bound direct object pronoun *l(e)* seem to refer to the predicate *intelligent*. I must leave this issue unresolved here.

Notes.

[1] I am using the term "proposition" for convenience to designate the situations, states, or events denoted by propositions.

[2] I am leaving open here, somewhat arbitrarily, the issue of the anaphoric function of tense morphemes (see Partee 1984). While I will subsume temporal expressions like *yesterday, in 1936,* or *before she went home* under the category "referential expression" (they can be anaphorically referred to with *then*), I will have nothing to say here about bound morphemes like the suffix *-ed* in *she laughed,* which may be said to anaphorically refer to the time at which the laughter occurred, much in the way in which the pronoun *she* anaphorically refers to its referent.

(Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents.* Cambridge University Press. より一部改変)

問（1）　下線部 (i) はどのようなことか、文例を使いながら、本文に即して具体的に説明しなさい（例は本文のものでも、自作の例でもどちらでも可）。

問（2）　下線部 (ii) を和訳しなさい。

問（3）　下線部 (iii) の理由について、本文に即して具体的に説明しなさい。

問（4）　下線部 (iv) について、ドイツ語やフランス語の presuposition は、上記で説明された英語における成り立ちとどのような点で異なるか、本文に即して具体的に説明しなさい。

II. 「東北大学言語学研究室」を標準語で通常の速度で発話した場合の発音を、IPA で表記しなさい。

III. 次の 10 語の中から 5 語を選び、和訳した上で簡潔に説明しなさい。

1. speech act　　　2. phonetic feature　　　3. priming effect　　　4. fossilization　　　5. alignment

6. vocabulary explosion　　　7. topicalization　　　8. aphasia　　　9. bound morpheme　　　10. sonority

【問題 I、問題 II、問題 III に対する解答は次頁以降にまとめて記すこと】

受験記号番号